

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 * * *

9 LARRY D. REAVES,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 SAN JOSE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, et
al.,

13 Defendants.

14 Case No. 3:14-cv-00602-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:14-cv-00603-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:14-cv-00604-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:14-cv-00609-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:14-cv-00646-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:14-cv-00657-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:14-cv-00673-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:15-cv-00025-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:15-cv-00028-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:15-cv-00048-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:15-cv-00055-MMD-VPC

15 ORDER ACCEPTING AND ADOPTING
16 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
17 OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE
VALERIE P. COOKE

18
19 Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate
20 Judge Valerie P. Cooke (dkt. no. 3) ("R&R") relating to plaintiff's initiation of forty-seven
21 separate cases in this District. The Defendants include various entities, including the
22 Department of Veteran Affairs, Greyhound Bus Lines, President Obama, the Governor of
23 an unnamed state, Bay Area Rapid Transit ("BART"), Western Union, various local
24 casinos and hotels, state court security guards, both the San Jose and Reno
25 International Airports, the United States Post Office, and many other entities and
26 individuals. No objection to the R&R has been filed.

27 This Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
28 recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party

1 timely objects to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, then the court is
2 required to "make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the [report and
3 recommendation] to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails
4 to object, however, the court is not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue
5 that is not the subject of an objection." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985).
6 Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a
7 magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See
8 *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard
9 of review employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to
10 which no objections were made); see also *Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219,
11 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Reyna-Tapia* as adopting the
12 view that district courts are not required to review "any issue that is not the subject of an
13 objection."). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge's recommendation, then
14 the court may accept the recommendation without review. See, e.g., *Johnstone*, 263 F.
15 Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge's recommendation to
16 which no objection was filed).

17 Nevertheless, this Court finds it appropriate to engage in a *de novo* review to
18 determine whether to adopt Magistrate Judge Cooke's R&R. As discussed in Magistrate
19 Judge Cooke's R&R, in each of plaintiff's cases, the initiating documents are merely
20 nonsensical words and numbers sprawled on pieces of paper, sometimes with a copy of
21 a bus ticket or other receipt of some kind. (See, e.g., 3:14-cv-00617-RCJ-VPC; 3:14-cv-
22 00673-MMD-VPC). Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a) states that a complaint must contain a short and
23 plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction, a claim showing that plaintiff is
24 entitled to relief, and the relief sought. Plaintiffs' documents contain mere gibberish, and
25 the sheer number of cases initiated since October 2014 are a clear indication that
26 plaintiff's claims, even if they were clearly articulated, would likely be based on
27 conclusions that are untenable. "It is not the court's job to wade through pages of
28 incoherent gobbledegook in search of a single claim that may have merit." *Shalla! v.*

1 Gates, 254 F.R.D. 140, 143 n. 6 (D.D.C. 2008). Upon reviewing the R&R and the
2 filings in Plaintiffs' cases, this Court finds good cause to accept and adopt the Magistrate
3 Judge's R&R in full.

4 It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that the Report and
5 Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Valerie P. Cooke (dkt. no. 3) is accepted and
6 adopted in its entirety.

7 It is further ordered that each of plaintiff's complaints listed above is dismissed
8 with prejudice.

9 The Clerk is directed to close this case.

10 DATED THIS 27th day of April 2015.
11

12 
13 MIRANDA M. DU
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28